

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/619,707	07/15/2003	Un-Chul Paek	5000-1-191DIV	7100	
33942 7	7590 10/28/2005		EXAMINER		
CHA & REITER, LLC			LOPEZ, CARLOS N		
210 ROUTE 4 PARAMUS, N	EAST STE 103 NJ 07652		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,			1731		
			DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005	DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

÷.			1~
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/619,707	PAEK ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lopez	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the followlaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of		- 6 1	:
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th.			er is later. In no
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		RST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the s after the mailing date of the final rejectio	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) ay reduce any
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must t AMENDMENTS 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	insideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	• ——	4:	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	allowable if submitted in a separate,	, timely filed amendin	ient canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-8 and 10</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by	ut before or on the date of filing a N	Notice of Appeal will r	not be entered

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

See Continuation Sheet.

because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary

entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be

11. Main The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

13. Other: ____.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly filed limitation of providing "a gas supplier for supplying gas into the air holes via the preform cover" requires further consideration and search. The newly filed limitation now provides a gas supplier supplying gas to the air holes of the preform via the preform cover, thus placing the gas supplier adjacent to or in direct communication with the preform cover; A limitation that requires further consideration and search. Additionally, the proposed amendment to claim 8 would result in a 112 2nd paragraph rejection since the term "the preform sealing means" would lack antecedent basis..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's arguments regarding the 35 USC rejection under Oh et al US 6,519,974, the rejection is withdrawn. However, the rejection under the British patent equivalent, GB 2314077A, is maintained since it qualifies as prior art under 102 (a) and (b).

Applicant argues that supplying gas into the air holes prevents the air holes from being distorted and nowhere in Oh's disclosure shows a prevention of air holes from being distorted (see applicant's arguemnts presented in pages 6-7). As previously noted, the claimed invention is drawn to an apparatus and not to a method of using an apparatus. Hence, the claimed invention is being examined based on its structural features per se and not on method of using limitations.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700